

Judging Rubric for Poster Presentation of Research

"adapted from the rubric developed by the American Society for Microbiology and the Committee for the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS)."

Score	Hypothesis / Goals and Background	Experimental Logic	Results	Conclusions and Future Work	Poster Board
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Project had a goal or a logical hypothesis that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance. Broad impact beyond project clearly stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or goal of project. Excellent original thinking or innovation of technique. Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear, thorough and logical. Potential problems and alternative approaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given and strongly supported with evidence. Conclusion was connected to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of the presenter. Text is concise, free of spelling or typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. Figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance visual appeal.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A logical hypothesis or goal was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. Goal of project or a logical hypothesis was stated clearly, showed relevance beyond project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or goal of project. Very good original thinking. Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address the hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear and logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence. Conclusion was connected to hypothesis or project goals but their relevance was not discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All components are present, but layout is crowded or confusing to follow in absence of presenter. Text is relatively clear, mostly free of spelling and typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. Most figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A questionable hypothesis or project goal was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goal. Good original thinking. Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals. Presentation of data was not entirely clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given. Conclusions were not compared to the hypothesis or project goal and their relevance was not discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. Text is relatively clear, but some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. Figures and tables not always related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A questionable hypothesis was presented and was not well supported or the goal of the project was not clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method not appropriate to address hypothesis or goal of project. No original thinking. Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some controls or comparative groups missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some data were lacking, not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goal. Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were given. Little connection to hypothesis or goal was apparent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. Text is hard to read due to font size or color, some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. Figures and tables not related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hypothesis or goal was inappropriate or not stated. Little or no background information was included or connected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods section missing. No original thinking. Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are not yet available or reproducible. Presentation of data was missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were missing. There was no connection with the hypothesis or project goal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. Text hard to read, messy and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors; very poor background. Figures and tables poorly done. Visual aids not used.

Judging Rubric for Presenter

Score	Knowledge of Project	Logical Presentation	Background Information	Presence
5	Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly.	Presentation is consistently clear and logical. Comfortably uses visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the research project and project background.	Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact.
4	Answers most questions.	Presentation is clear for the most part, but not consistently. Comfortably uses visual aids (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates a good knowledge of the research project and project background.	Speaks clearly, naturally; makes eye contact.
3	Has some difficulty answering challenging questions.	Presentation is generally unclear and inconsistent. Uses some visual aids (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project and project background.	Reads from poster or script some of the time.
2	Has difficulty answering challenging questions.	Presentation unclear and illogical. Does not use visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation effectively.	Demonstrates poor knowledge of the research project.	Reads from the poster or script most of the time.
1	Does not understand questions.	Presentation very confusing. Does not use the visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation effectively.	Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project.	Reads from poster or script all of the time.